



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*ll*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,612	12/22/2003	Arjen Bot	F7756(V)	7563

201 7590 11/08/2006

UNILEVER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
700 SYLVAN AVENUE,  
BLDG C2 SOUTH  
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100

EXAMINER

PADEN, CAROLYN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/743,612

**Applicant(s)**

BOT ET AL.

**Examiner**

Carolyn A. Paden

**Art Unit**

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 12, 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-21-05.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 1 & 2 recites the broad recitation of ingredients, and the claim also recites the preferable range of ingredients which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 13 provides for the use of the fat blend, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear

what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent basis for "the cream" in claims 2-4.  
Clarification is requested.

Claims 5-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bot (WO03/043430).

Bot was cited as an X reference in an international search report.

Bot discloses a water continuous acidified food containing a biopolymer and a protein. The food contains 5-40 wt% fat, 0.05-15 wt% protein and 0.01-3 wt % biopolymer (page 3, summary). The biopolymers are selected from a host of ingredients other than pectin (page 7, paragraphs 3 & 4). The fat may include combinations of up to 45% dairy fat and vegetable or marine oil (bottom of page 8 and top of page 9) to provide a solids content of amounts that depend upon the temperature of measurement shown at page 9, second paragraph. The Stevens values of the spread are shown at the top of page 4 to fall within the range of claim 1. Claim 1 appears to differ from Bot in the recitation of the ratio of N15 to N5. Bot does not describe the extent of solids that are present in his product at 5C but the ratio of the values of the solids contents at N20 and N10 appear to provide a ratio that is within the range of the claims. Since all of the other ingredients in Bot are the same as the present claimed invention, no

unobvious or unexpected result is seen from the differences in the ratio of N15/N5 and N20/N10.

Claim 4 refers to the lack of emulsifiers in the product. Bodor discloses the emulsifiers are optional ingredients at page 10, first full paragraph.

Claim 2 refers to a pH value in the final product, which is disclosed in example 6 and at page 12, last paragraph.

Claims 1-4 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodor (WO99/51105).

Bodor was cited as an X reference in an international search report.

Bodor discloses an acidified butter-like spread containing more than 35 wt% fat and less than 3 wt% protein. The product has a Stevens value that is within the range set forth in claim 1 (see abstract). The fat or cream in the product is made from dairy and vegetable fat (page 5, lines 19-24) at a weight ratio of 20/80 to 80/20 (page 10, lines 9-11). The pH of the product falls within the range set forth in claim 2 (page 9, lines 27-31). The melting characteristics of the fat are described on pages 10-11. Claim 1 appears to differ from Bodor in the specific N15/N5 ratio. Bodor discloses solid fat contents at higher temperatures but the ratio of N25/N10 appears to provide a ratio that is within the range of the claims. Since all of the

other ingredients in Bodor are the same as the present claimed invention, no unobvious or unexpected result is seen from the differences in the ratio of N15/N5 and N25/N10. The dairy fat is described as having utility for cream cheese at page 10, lines 13-19. The biopolymers in the product are disclosed to include a host of ingredients other than gelatin.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached on (571) 272-1398 or by dialing 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

Application/Control Number: 10/743,612  
Art Unit: 1761

Page 7

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
CAROLYN PADEN 11-7-06  
PRIMARY EXAMINER 1761